

**CALIFORNIA WATER QUALITY MONITORING COUNCIL**

**Monitoring Council Meeting Notes**

**Friday, May 29, 2015 – 10:00 AM to 5:00 PM**

Large Conference Room  
Southern California Coastal Water Research Project (SCCWRP)  
3535 Harbor Blvd., Suite 110, Costa Mesa



Monitoring Council Members and (Alternates) in attendance:

Jonathan Bishop	Sarge Green	(Travis Pritchard)	Stephen Weisberg
Beth Christman	Karen Larsen	Armand Ruby	
(Greg Gearheart)	(Phil Markle)	(Ken Schiff)	

Others in attendance or (on the phone):

Jamie Aderhold, Aqualytical  
(Sara Aminzadeh, California Coastkeeper Alliance)  
Beverley Anderson, State Water Resources Control Board  
Yousif Astarabadi, AquaCloud  
(Karen Atkins, Sierra Fund)  
(Shakoora Azimi-Gaylon, Delta Conservancy)  
(Adam Ballard, Department of Fish and Wildlife)  
Brock Bernstein, independent contractor  
(Helen Birss, Department of Fish and Wildlife)  
(Maggie Christman, Delta Stewardship Council)  
(Zaffar Eusuff, Department of Water Resources)  
(Phil Gibbons, Port of San Diego)  
Michel Haddad, AquaCloud  
(Rainer Hoenicke, Delta Science Program)  
(Katja Irvin, Sierra Club)  
Kris Jones, California Water Quality Monitoring Council / Department of Water Resources  
(Paul Jones, United States Environmental Protection Agency)  
(Holly Jorgensen, Sacramento River Watershed Program)  
Dawn Koepke, McHugh, Koepke and Associates  
(Jim Kreft, U.S. Geological Survey)  
Leslie Laudon, State Water Resources Control Board  
Kelvin Liu, Orange County Public Works  
Jon Marshack, California Water Quality Monitoring Council / State Water Resources Control Board  
(Stephen McCord, McCord Environmental, Inc.)  
(Peter Ode, Department of Fish and Wildlife)  
(Dave Osti, 34 North)  
(Chris Potter, Natural Resources Agency)  
(Mark Pranger, Moss Landing Marine Laboratories)  
(Shana Rapoport, Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board)  
Grant Sharp, Orange County Public Works  
Linda Sheehan, Earth Law Center  
(Stephani Spaar, Department of Water Resources)  
(Hildie Spautz, Department of Fish and Wildlife)  
Frances Spivy-Weber, State Water Resources Control Board  
Guangyu Wang, Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission  
Lori Webber, State Water Resources Control Board  
(Alisha Wenzel, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board)  
Liz Whiteman, Ocean Science Trust

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>INTRODUCTIONS AND HOUSEKEEPING</b>	
<b>Purpose:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Introductions (in the room and on the phone)</li> <li>2) Review draft notes from February 23, 2015 Monitoring Council meeting</li> <li>3) Review agenda for today's meeting</li> </ol>	
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Approve February 23, 2015 Monitoring Council meeting notes</li> <li>b) Preview what will be covered today and overall meeting expectations</li> <li>c) Adjust today's agenda, as needed</li> </ol>	
<b>Attachment Link:</b>	<a href="#">Notes from February 23, 2015 Monitoring Council meeting</a>	
<b>Contact Persons:</b>	Kris Jones Jon Marshack	<a href="mailto:kristopher.jones@water.ca.gov">kristopher.jones@water.ca.gov</a> , (916) 376-9756 <a href="mailto:jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov">jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov</a> , (916) 341-5514
<b>Notes:</b>	Armand Ruby indicated that based on the meeting notes from February 23, the list of future agenda items for today's meeting should include an item regarding how the Department of Pesticide Regulation could be involved in Monitoring Council efforts. Armand indicated that both he and Sarge Green had suggested this item.	
<b>Decisions:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting notes from February 23 were approved with amendments from Armand Ruby, Hildie Spautz, Kristal Davis-Fadtke, and Bryn Phillips.</li> <li>• Agenda item 7 was heard before Item 6.</li> </ul>	

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>PUBLIC FORUM</b>	
<b>Purpose:</b>	Any member of the public may address and ask questions of the Monitoring Council relating to any matter within the Council's jurisdiction under California Senate Bill 1070 (Statutes of 2006) provided the matter is not on the agenda.	
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	Information and potential agenda topics for a future meeting	
<b>Attachment Link:</b>	<a href="#">California Senate Bill 1070 (Statutes of 2006)</a>	
<b>Contact Persons:</b>	Jon Marshack Kris Jones	<a href="mailto:jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov">jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov</a> ; (916) 341-5514 <a href="mailto:kristopher.jones@water.ca.gov">kristopher.jones@water.ca.gov</a> ; (916) 376-9756
<b>Notes:</b>	No issues or questions were raised by those members of the public in attendance or participating by phone.	

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES</b>
<b>Purpose:</b>	<p>These are brief informational items that could be expanded into more detailed discussions for future meetings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring Council Position Changes (Jon Marshack)</li> <li>November 30 meeting conflict</li> <li>Environmental Data Summit White Paper</li> <li>Other brief announcements and updates related to the Monitoring Council's mission pursuant to Senate Bill 1070, Statutes of 2006</li> </ol>
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	Information and comment
<b>Background:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <p><b><i>Monitoring Council Position Changes</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b><i>Public</i></b> – Sara Aminzadeh named Travis Pritchard of the San Diego Coastkeeper as her Alternate on the Monitoring Council, replacing Sean Bothwell.</li> <li><b><i>Regulated Community, POTWs</i></b> – In April of 2015, Mr. Connor tendered his resignation and the California Association of Sanitation Agencies recommended that Phil Markle of the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (LACSD) replace Mr. Connor on the Council. Mr. Markle has served as the Alternate to Mr. Connor on the Monitoring Council. On May 13, a letter was sent from the Council Co-Chairs to the two Agency Secretaries recommending that Phil Markle become the Member representing POTWs.</li> <li><b><i>Agriculture</i></b> – Parry Klassen has indicated he will be resigning from the Monitoring Council and endorsing his Alternate, Bruce Houdesheldt of the Northern California Water Association, to take his place. Parry has offered to stay on as an Alternate in this position.</li> </ul> </li> <li> <p><b><i>November 30 meeting conflict</i></b> – The selected date for the last California Monitoring Council meeting of 2015, November 30, is in conflict with the next in-person meeting of the National Water Quality Monitoring Council at the NOAA National Water Center in Tuscaloosa, Alabama. California Monitoring Council Director Jon Marshack is also a member of the National Monitoring Council. He will ask the California Monitoring Council whether they would like to reschedule their meeting so that Jon can attend.</p> </li> <li> <p><b><i>Environmental Data Summit White Paper</i></b> – The Delta Science Program of the Delta Stewardship Council held the Environmental Data Summit in June 2014. Since then, the Delta Science Program has been developing a “vision document” or “white paper” outlining findings and recommendations that arose from that two-day meeting. Monitoring Council Members commented on a preliminary draft of the white paper at the December 2014 meeting and voted to formally endorse the document as a restatement and refinement of data management and data access recommendations found in the Monitoring Council's earlier recommendations. A <a href="#">public review draft of the white paper</a> was released in February. The public comment period closed on March 27.</p> </li> </ol>

<b>Attachment Links:</b>	a) <a href="#">Phil Markle Recommendation Letter to Agency Secretaries</a> b) <a href="#">National Water Quality Monitoring Council website</a> c) <a href="#">2014 Environmental Data Summit website</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Public review draft white paper, <a href="#">Enhancing the Vision for Managing California's Environmental Information</a></li> </ul>	
<b>Contact Persons:</b>	Jon Marshack Kris Jones	<a href="mailto:jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov">jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov</a> ; (916) 341-5514 <a href="mailto:kristopher.jones@water.ca.gov">kristopher.jones@water.ca.gov</a> ; (916) 376-9756
<b>Notes:</b>	a) <b>Monitoring Council Position Changes</b> – Jon Marshack went over several position changes within the Monitoring Council. Sara Aminzadeh named Travis Pritchard of the San Diego Coastkeeper as her Alternate on the Monitoring Council, replacing Sean Bothwell. Mike Connor tendered his resignation and the California Association of Sanitation Agencies recommended that Phil Markle of the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (LACSD) serve as Mike's replacement on the Council. On May 13, a letter was sent from the Council Co-Chairs to the two Agency Secretaries recommending that Phil Markle become the Member representing POTWs. The letter asked for the approval of the Agency Secretaries by June 12th. Jon also indicated that Parry Klassen has offered to resign from the Monitoring Council and has endorsed his Alternate, Bruce Houdesheldt of the Northern California Water Association, to take his place. Parry has offered to stay on as Bruce's Alternate on the Council. Jon is awaiting a formal letter of resignation from Parry as well as details regarding Bruce's background and endorsements from agricultural interests before he would be able to officially propose the change to the Agency Secretaries. b) <b>November 30 meeting conflict</b> – Jon Marshack indicated that the Monitoring Council meeting scheduled for November 30 conflicts with a National Water Quality Monitoring Council meeting he is scheduled to attend in Tuscaloosa, Alabama. Jon asked whether the Council members would rather keep the meeting date the same or reschedule so that he could attend both meetings. Jonathan Bishop suggested that Jon send out a Doodle poll to determine whether an alternate meeting date is feasible. If an alternate meeting date is not feasible, Kris Jones would facilitate the meeting on November 30. Other Council members agreed with Jonathan's suggestion. c) <b>Environmental Data Summit White Paper</b> – Jon Marshack provided background regarding the Environmental Data Summit White Paper, as well as the Monitoring Council's endorsement of the paper in December 2015. Jon indicated that changes proposed by Scott Gregory of the Department of Technology will be incorporated in the final version of the document, scheduled to be release in June. Jon also mentioned the Council's previous recommendation that the Data Management Workgroup help implement the recommendations laid out in the White Paper. Sarge Green asked Jon to provide additional details regarding the changes suggested by Scott Gregory. Mr. Gregory offered the following in his comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding – tactical and strategic funding is vital to any data management plan for the state.</li> <li>• Executive Sponsorship – this plan will need acceptance and adoption at high levels within government.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leverage existing Infrastructure – much of the technology required already exists and is managed by the State of CA; it should be leveraged.</li> <li>• Relationship – relationships are everything in an endeavor like this. Institutional knowledge and connections made by individuals, strategically placed, will bring success much faster to the proposed program.</li> <li>• Work Groups – I have observed that when we try to analyze too much, we create paralysis. I would caution over analysis – and encourage more direct action.</li> </ul> <p>Jon indicated that these comments would not significantly alter the White Paper recommendations already endorsed by the Monitoring Council.</p>
<b>Action Items:</b>	<p>Jon Marshack will send out a Doodle poll to determine whether an alternative date is feasible for the Monitoring Council meeting currently scheduled for November 30. <i>Note: Based on Doodle poll results, the final Monitoring Council meeting for 2015 will be held on December 11 in Sacramento.</i></p>

<b>ITEM:</b>	4
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>NATIONAL WATER QUALITY PORTAL</b>
<b>Purpose:</b>	Jim Kreft of the US Geological Survey presented and demonstrated the capability of the National Water Quality Portal
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	Discuss the utility of this portal for data access between monitoring programs
<b>Background:</b>	<p>The Water Quality Portal (WQP) is a cooperative service sponsored by the United States Geological Survey (USGS), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the National Water Quality Monitoring Council (NWQMC) that integrates publicly available water quality data from the USGS National Water Information System (NWIS) the USEPA STOrage and RETrieval (STORET) Data Warehouse, and the USDA ARS Sustaining The Earth's Watersheds - Agricultural Research Database System (STEWARDS).</p> <p>The USEPA water quality data originate from the STORET Data Warehouse, which is the USEPA's repository of water quality monitoring data collected by water resource management groups across the country. Organizations, including states, tribes, watershed groups, other federal agencies, volunteer groups and universities, submit data to the STORET Warehouse in order to make their data publicly accessible. For more information about STORET, see the <a href="#">STORET Home Page</a>. The Water Boards' California Environmental Data Exchange Network (CEDEN) has uploaded data into STORET through the national Water Quality Exchange (WQX) and is working to develop two-way communication between these systems. Such connections make CEDEN data available through the National Water Quality Portal. Other state organizations (e.g., Division of Drinking Water, Department of Water Resources) are pursuing linkages of one or more of their data systems with WQX.</p> <p>The USGS water quality data originate from the NWISWeb Database. The database contains current and historical water data from more than 1.5 million sites across the nation and is used by state and local governments, public and</p>

	<p>private utilities, private citizens, and other federal agencies involved with managing our water resources. For more information on what data are available and how NWIS data are mapped to the Water Quality Exchange (WQX) format, visit <a href="#">NWIS Water Quality Web Services</a>.</p> <p>The ARS water quality data originate from the STEWARDS (Sustaining The Earth's Watersheds - Agricultural Research Database System) database and were developed as part of the Conservation Effects Assessment Program (CEAP). STEWARDS contains long-term hydrologic, weather, and water quality data from 17 ARS benchmark research watersheds. For more information about STEWARDS, see the <a href="#">STEWARDS Home Page</a>.</p>		
<b>Attachment Links:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">National Water Quality Portal</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Water Quality Portal</a> – presentation by Jim Kreft</li> </ul>		
<b>Contact Person:</b>	<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Jim Kreft</td> <td style="width: 50%;"><a href="mailto:jkreft@usgs.gov">jkreft@usgs.gov</a>; (608) 821-3919</td> </tr> </table>	Jim Kreft	<a href="mailto:jkreft@usgs.gov">jkreft@usgs.gov</a> ; (608) 821-3919
Jim Kreft	<a href="mailto:jkreft@usgs.gov">jkreft@usgs.gov</a> ; (608) 821-3919		
<b>Notes:</b>	<p>Jim Kreft made a <a href="#">presentation</a> regarding the National Water Quality Portal. During his presentation, Jim provided background on the portal, and discussed the “New Jersey Problem.” He described how New Jersey collected data in a cooperative agreement with U.S. Geological Survey; however, combining data between the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (where data was submitted to STORET) and the U.S. Geological Survey (whose data was in NWIS) was laborious and error-prone. To address this issue, Jim described how the USGS and EPA agreed to deliver data in a common format, so that they could be more easily combined. Their underlying goal was to ensure that the data from these databases were documented and their quality described so that users can establish the utility and comparability of the data. Jim highlighted the benefits of the portal: 1) reduces the effort to use other data sources; 2) it leverages and protects investments in monitoring data; and 3) it supports water quality based decision making. He then provided details regarding the analyses of the Water Quality Portal usage over the past few years, showing that usage continues to rise, but highlighted the importance and rising use of the portal's web services. Jim then provided a demonstration of the portal and its query tools.</p> <p>Following Jim's presentation, Jon Marshack informed the group that the STORET database contains data from states and tribes around the country. He indicated that CEDEN also has up-loaded data into STORET via the Water Quality Exchange (WQX). Jon added that the hope is to have two way communication between STORET and CEDEN to provide a broader dataset for decision-making (e.g., for impaired water listings). Jonathan Bishop then asked, if it would it be possible for the My Water Quality portals to utilize the National Water Quality Portal's data query and web services functionality? Jim said yes—the use of their interface and mapping tools would be available for use in the My Water Quality portals. Steve Weisberg mentioned that the down side of this is that much of our data are specific to California programs (e.g., SWAMP), which have biological data and other data types that are not currently included in the National Water Quality Portal interface. Jonathan Bishop recalled that SWAMP had once considered STORET instead of CEDEN for its data storage, and that similar concerns were raised at that time. He added that there have been improvements recently which would alleviate those concerns. Steve suggested that the Council have an action item to help WQX/STORET incorporate certain</p>		

	<p>parameters into their framework. Steve indicated that he saw two benefits of collaborating with the WQX effort, including improved: 1) query tools; 2) funding opportunities; and 3) access to non-CEDEN datasets (e.g., USGS and tribal data). However, Steve added that a potential drawback would be issues with the connection between CEDEN and WQX (which is the process of being fixed). He also added that unless WQX/STORET were to cover all of the data types needed by California, there would still be a need for a dual system. Steve reiterated the need that we communicate with the NWQMC regarding how the WQX/STORET/Water Quality Portal framework could be modified to meet our needs. Jim indicated that they would greatly appreciate that type of feedback, and expressed an interest in the Monitoring Council partnering with them in their efforts. Jonathan Bishop indicated that he sees value in this type of collaboration, and would work with Greg Gearheart to develop this type of partnership. He mentioned that the WQX appears to have the capacity and infrastructure to maintain data systems—he added that the Monitoring Council would greatly benefit from a partnership that leverages these resources. Armand Ruby added that the Monitoring Council should not view this as a static arrangement. Rather, it's an ongoing process with regular updates (e.g., nomenclature, etc.). For example, Armand added that the databases need to have QA/QC checkers regularly reviewing and updating the data. Jonathan Bishop and others agreed with this point.</p>
<b>Action Items:</b>	<p>Greg Gearheart and his staff will provide details to Jim Kreft regarding specific modifications to WQX/STORET, which would allow better integration of California's data and data types.</p>

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>BRIEFINGS WITH CAL/EPA SECRETARY AND UNDERSECRETARY</b>
<b>Purpose:</b>	Update the Monitoring Council on recent feedback to the Triennial Audit Report from Cal/EPA Secretary Matthew Rodriquez and Undersecretary Gordon Burns
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	Discussion and direction to Monitoring Council staff
<b>Background:</b>	<p>The Monitoring Council's enabling legislation, SB 1070 (Statutes of 2006), requires that the Secretary of the California Environmental Protection Agency conduct a triennial audit of the effectiveness of the Comprehensive Monitoring Program Strategy, adopted by the Monitoring Council in December 2010. Cal/EPA Secretary Matthew Rodriquez requested that the Monitoring Council conduct a self-evaluation. The resulting <a href="#">audit report</a> was approved by the Council at the December 2014 meeting and sent to the Agency Secretaries and made available to the public on December 23. A briefing on the audit for Secretary Rodriquez was held on February 24. Two follow-up meetings were held with Undersecretary Burns on February 27 and April 3.</p>
<b>Attachment Links:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Increasing Efficiency and Effectiveness Through Collaboration: First Triennial Audit Report</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <a href="#">Audit Report Cover Letter to Cal/EPA Secretary Rodriquez</a></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#">Water Quality Monitoring Council's Comprehensive Strategy Supports California Water Action Plan Implementation</a> – paper by Jon Marshack and</li> </ul>

	Kris Jones	
<b>Contact Person:</b>	Jon Marshack	<a href="mailto:jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov">jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov</a> ; (916) 341-5514
<b>Notes:</b>	<p>Jon Marshack provided an overview of the meeting with Cal/EPA Secretary Matthew Rodriguez to present and discuss the <a href="#">Triennial Audit Report</a>. In addition to the Secretary, in attendance for the initial briefing were Undersecretary Gordon Burns, Deputy Secretary for Policy and Legislative Affairs Tara Dias-Andress, Stephani Spaar and Kris Jones from DWR, Tom Howard and Greg Gearheart from the State Water Board.</p> <p>Jon mentioned that Secretary Rodriguez expressed sincere appreciation for the efforts of the Monitoring Council and its workgroups, saying that we are to be commended for meritorious work. But he also expressed an interest in consolidating efforts, voicing the opinion that there are already too many workgroups that can get in the way of other work. He and Gordon Burns could see how the Monitoring Council's efforts could be plugged into Water Action Plan implementation with respect to water reliability and habitat restoration, cooperation among agencies and sharing data. The Secretary wondered whether it would make sense to elevate the efforts of the Monitoring Council to get us more involved in these larger picture mainstream coordination efforts? Jon shared Tom Howard's comment that the Water Boards and DWR are committed to the Monitoring Council effort. Tom added that the Monitoring Council's efforts are imbedded in the Water Boards' organization.</p> <p>Jon mentioned that a follow up meeting was later held with Undersecretary Gordon Burns to discuss the Monitoring Council's <i>Strategy</i> as well as ways in which the Monitoring Council's efforts could be elevated to address key initiatives such as the Water Action Plan, Bay Delta Conservation Plan, or the Water Plan Update. Jon added that a second follow up meeting took place with Undersecretary Burns, which focused on the ways in which the <a href="#">Monitoring Council's efforts specifically support the Water Action Plan</a>. During that meeting Jonathan Bishop suggested that a "Delta Data Dashboard" could be developed as a tool to inform management regarding key initiatives; for example, it would be useful to have indicators of ecosystem health and be able to assess the effect of certain management actions on those indicators (e.g., in response to flows, changing point of diversion, timing of releases, allocations, habitat restoration). Jonathan mentioned that developing these types of tools—and linking them to key initiatives such as the Water Action Plan or for adaptive management of the Delta—will help raise the profile of the Monitoring Council, its workgroups and the portals. Successes will benefit other Monitoring Council efforts.</p> <p>Jon briefly discussed an effort at the Water Board, which could provide financial support for these efforts. He also mentioned that they have also tried to link the Wetland Status and Trends Monitoring Program to this effort. Steve Weisberg mentioned that this was a nice step forward, but emphasized that this approach is a slight shift in the Monitoring Council's focus. He added that the Council and its workgroups have focused on collaboration, consistency in methods, and making those data available to the public and decision makers. Steve indicated that the new focus would shift our efforts towards turning data into information, which has not yet been dealt with as well by the workgroups. Steve mentioned that it is a different skill set to turn data into information. He added that this often requires workshops and peer review, which can also require funding. Greg Gearheart emphasized that there is a distinction between providing support for a topic versus providing information—information should be unbiased. Steve</p>	

mentioned the difficulty of developing indicators of ocean ecosystem health, for example, which required some level of judgement regarding benchmarks or assessments regarding status of certain indicators. Kris Jones indicated that the Estuary Workgroup also experienced some pushback regarding their work developing indicators of ecosystem health for the San Francisco Bay Delta Estuary when developing the State of the Estuary Report 2015. He mentioned that there were fewer concerns raised regarding the trends of the various indicators; however, assigning letter grades or judgements regarding the status of these indicators did raise concerns (e.g., from reviewers and management). Kris added that more time was needed to develop these assessments and acquire adequate peer review than was allowed in their collaboration with the San Francisco Estuary Partnership. He added that the Estuary Workgroup hopes to continue this work as they move forward. Jonathan Bishop and other Monitoring Council members emphasized the need to develop a peer review process as the Estuary Workgroup develops the Delta Data Dashboard as well as the indicators of estuary health. Jonathan also cautioned that the effort will need to take an incremental approach to building these tools. Being built by existing workgroup partnerships under the auspices of the Monitoring Council may shield these efforts from some departmental scrutiny.

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>6 – Note: This item was heard after Item 7.</b>
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK AND INDICATORS FOR THE ECOLOGICAL HEALTH OF HABITATS IN SANTA MONICA BAY</b>
<b>Purpose:</b>	Dr. Guangyu Wang, Deputy Director of the Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission shared the efforts made by the Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program to assess and report on the ecosystem health of Santa Monica Bay
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	To facilitate collaboration in collection of more monitoring data and sharing of these data useful in assessment of ecosystem health
<b>Background:</b>	<p>The Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission (SMBRC) is part of the Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program (SMBNEP) which was established by federal EPA and the State to develop and implement a comprehensive restoration plan for Santa Monica Bay. The Bay Restoration Plan (BRP) include hundreds of objectives, milestones, and action recommendations, which align with the program’s mission to improve water quality, conserve and rehabilitate natural resources, and protect the Bay’s human benefits and values. In the mid-1990s, a comprehensive monitoring program (CMP) was developed and implemented for providing a regional, long-term picture of the status and trends of the Bay’s environmental conditions, and more importantly, for linking these status and trends to the progress made toward achieving the goals and objectives of the BRP. Specifically, the CMP was aimed to shift the focus of monitoring effort from physical and chemical measurements of major pollutant discharges to biological monitoring needed to fulfill many identified data gaps in the Bay’s habitats and natural resources.</p> <p>The need for developing a new habitat health assessment reflects several changes in recent years including: greater awareness of the regional nature of environmental stressors and impacts; increased interest in assessing and managing habitats and resources on a regional basis; and greater knowledge of</p>

	<p>the interactions between sources of anthropogenic impact and environmental processes. The new habitat health assessment framework was developed to encompass and link all stressors, processes, and impacts for all major habitats in the Bay. The framework will be used to guide the update of the CMP and the development of a comprehensive State of the Bay report every five years.</p>	
<p><b>Attachment Links:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">State of the Bay 2010 Report</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Assessment Framework and Indicators for the Ecological Health of Habitats in Santa Monica Bay</a> – presentation by Guangyu Wang</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Contact Person:</b></p>	<p>Guangyu Wang</p>	<p><a href="mailto:gwang@waterboards.ca.gov">gwang@waterboards.ca.gov</a>, (213) 576-6639</p>
<p><b>Notes:</b></p>	<p>Guangyu Wang made a <a href="#">presentation</a> regarding the indicators of ecological health of habitats in the Santa Monica Bay. The mission of the collaborative group is to develop and oversee the implementation of a comprehensive conservation and management plan. Guangyu indicated that the Santa Monica Bay Restoration Plan (BRP) has three program areas: 1) Improvement of water quality; 2) conservation and rehabilitation of natural resources; and 3) protection of human benefits and values.</p> <p>The State of the Bay Report is a comprehensive analysis of the bay's environmental conditions, which is published every five years. Guangyu described their methods for developing the report and their findings, which highlighted the need for a comprehensive monitoring program that would provide a regional, long-term assessment of the condition of the various habitats in the Santa Monica Bay. Their hope was to focus management needs, and identify overlaps and duplications of efforts, as well as information gaps.</p> <p>Near the end of his presentation, Guangyu indicated that he saw a nexus between the work proposed by Liz Whiteman (Item 7) and the work of the Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission—specifically work relating to the Rocky Intertidal Habitat and Marine Protected Areas. Speaking more broadly, Guangyu also recognized a clear nexus in their efforts and that of the Monitoring Council, indicating that both have a similar approach and strategy, focusing on beaches, seafood consumption, and habitats.</p> <p>Steve Weisberg mentioned the connection between this work and the efforts of the San Francisco Estuary Partnership. Kris Jones indicated that the work currently being performed by the Estuary Workgroup in their collaboration with the San Francisco Estuary Partnership closely parallels the work of the Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission. Kris raised the point that though the Estuary Workgroup currently is focusing on the San Francisco Bay Delta Estuary that they are interested in expanding to include California's other estuaries—since the Monitoring Council's workgroups have a statewide focus. He added that the Estuary Workgroup would greatly benefit from collaboration with the Santa Monica Bay, particularly in the development of indicators.</p>	

<b>ITEM:</b>	7	
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>CONVENING OF THE OCEAN AND COASTAL ECOSYSTEM WORKGROUP AND DEVELOPMENT OF A MY WATER QUALITY PORTAL ON THE THEME OF OCEAN AND COASTAL ECOSYSTEM HEALTH</b>	
<b>Purpose:</b>	Liz Whiteman of the Ocean Science Trust presented a framework for initial development of an ocean-themed workgroup and portal that links Marine Protected Areas (MPA) and Areas of Special Biological Significance (ASBS) monitoring programs and serves to advance an integrated, sustainable ocean monitoring program that supports multiple mandates around ocean health.	
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	Support by the Monitoring Council to develop workgroup and portal	
<b>Background:</b>	<p>The Ocean Science Trust oversaw a partnerships-based process to develop a <a href="#">Roadmap</a>, which lays out a stepped process for the development of one or more collaborative workgroups and a portal focusing on ocean and coastal ecosystem health. One of the potential issue-areas highlighted in the Roadmap is the link between MPA monitoring and water quality monitoring, particularly ASBS monitoring. This topic is ripe for focused attention and portal implementation when considering increased interest and funding of these programs that have well-developed management questions, regulatory and management structures, ongoing monitoring that is relatively well coordinated, and active efforts to develop more integrated assessment approaches.</p> <p>Following the phased-approach detailed in the Roadmap, it is proposed that a subgroup be created to advance the development of a portal linking MPA and ASBS monitoring programs, with an initial focus on rocky intertidal habitats. The charge of this workgroup will include determining core management questions, identifying currently available relevant data and which is authoritative, and defining current data access capability. The workgroup will also help develop the portal for presentation of authoritative information and data, and conduct outreach to decision makers, the public, and agency staff.</p>	
<b>Attachment Links:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">My Water Quality Ocean Portal Roadmap</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Ocean Health Workgroup and Portal</a> – presentation by Liz Whiteman</li> </ul>	
<b>Contact Persons:</b>	Liz Whiteman Aaron McGregor Jim Wicker	<a href="mailto:liz.whiteman@oceansciencetrust.org">liz.whiteman@oceansciencetrust.org</a> ; 510-251-8317 <a href="mailto:aaron.mcgregor@oceansciencetrust.org">aaron.mcgregor@oceansciencetrust.org</a> ; 510-251-8328 <a href="mailto:jim.wicker@oceansciencetrust.org">jim.wicker@oceansciencetrust.org</a> ; 510-251-8330
<b>Notes:</b>	Liz Whiteman made a <a href="#">presentation</a> regarding the path forward to convene a workgroup focusing on Ocean and Coastal Ecosystem Health. Since identifying the priority subject areas through the <a href="#">Ocean Portal Roadmap effort</a> , Liz recommended an initial focus on one of these priority areas. The advantages of this approach would be to more effectively develop a workgroup and portal, which will be more likely to attract visibility and the support of stakeholders and potential partners. Liz indicated that the “low-hanging fruit” in terms of subject areas to devote their initial attention would be the alignment/integration of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and Areas of Special Biological Significance (ASBS) monitoring for rocky intertidal habitats. Liz indicated that this integration is a strategic priority for the State Water Board and the Ocean Protection Council,	

	<p>and could leverage the work of similar efforts (OceanSpaces, Rocky Intertidal Portal etc.). In addition, Liz mentioned that the regional MPA programs could also provide a rich dataset for integrated analyses, particularly in the south coast region. She highlighted potential partners, including: State Water Board, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Ocean Protection Council, Ocean Science Trust, Southern California Coastal Water Research Project (SCCWRP), UC Santa Cruz, Multi-Agency Rocky Intertidal Network (MARINE), Partnership for Interdisciplinary Studies of Coastal Oceans (PISCO), and California Coastkeeper Alliance. Liz also mentioned the possibility of hosting another joint fellowship with SCCWRP, which could be used to support this effort.</p> <p>Following her presentation, Jon asked whether MARINE had made much progress developing indicators of ocean ecosystem health. Liz mentioned that there had been progress, but she indicated that the process was complicated. These indicators are still in development. Steve Weisberg indicated that the group held a series of workshops to provide input and peer review, and the workgroup has developed a manuscript which has been approved for publication. Steve indicated that the Ocean Ecosystem Health Workgroup will be a good next step to this effort.</p> <p>Jonathan Bishop mentioned that his take home from this presentation was that they need money for this effort. Liz indicated that with strategically applied new funding there are significant opportunities to leverage other investments to launch this effort. Jonathan clarified that the Monitoring Council does not have a budget. He added that the State Water Resources Control Board sometimes has money (e.g., mitigation funds from desalinization and once through cooling); however, he is uncertain how to get money to the Ocean Science Trust. Jonathan added that the State Water Board has Ambient Monitoring Program and other discretionary contract funds on an annual basis that might be made available.</p> <p>Steve Weisberg indicated that he thinks this is the best path forward and suggested that the Monitoring Council endorse their proposed approach. He indicated that the group would need researchers to help support this effort, and there is already a group in place (e.g., MARINE). Steve added that that effort didn't require much in the way of resources, only travel costs for members to participate and attend meetings and suggested foundation support. Other Monitoring Council members agreed that this approach was worth pursuing. Sara Aminzadeh suggested (by phone) incorporating an NGO outreach component to this effort (i.e., producers and users of the information) and that she is willing to help. Liz agreed with this point and welcomed the collaboration to advance this.</p>
<b>Decisions:</b>	Monitoring Council members endorsed moving forward with an ocean and coastal workgroup with an initial focus on the integration of MPA and ASBS monitoring for rocky intertidal habitats.
<b>Action Items:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jonathan Bishop will communicate with Liz Whiteman regarding seeking funding to support efforts of the Ocean and Coastal Ecosystem Workgroup—specifically efforts relating to MPA and ASBS monitoring for rocky intertidal habitats.</li> <li>• Sara Aminzadeh will help with NGO outreach.</li> </ul>

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>8</b>	
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>A WATER QUALITY PORTAL FOR THE SACRAMENTO RIVER WATERSHED</b>	
<b>Purpose:</b>	Stephen McCord of the Sacramento River Watershed Program described a new project by the Sacramento River Watershed Program to develop a web-based water quality portal for the Sacramento River Watershed	
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	Provide input and feedback on the proposed project's goals and initial steps	
<b>Background:</b>	Similar to the CA Estuaries portal being developed under the Monitoring Council, and to the recently produced San Joaquin Watershed RMP portal, this portal will address regional questions and issues of interest. The portal is expected to be developed by late 2016 with substantial stakeholder outreach and input.	
<b>Attachment Links:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Sacramento River Portal fact sheet</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">A Water Quality Portal for the Sacramento River Watershed</a> – presentation by Stephen McCord</li> </ul>	
<b>Contact Person:</b>	Stephen McCord	<a href="mailto:sam@mccenv.com">sam@mccenv.com</a> ; (530) 220-3165
<b>Notes:</b>	<p>Stephen McCord made a <a href="#">presentation</a> regarding the Sacramento River Watershed Program's effort to develop a portal. Stephen indicated that they are motivated to develop a comprehensive regional monitoring program (RMP). Their hope is to build on existing efforts, such as the Estuary Portal, Bay Delta Live or the San Joaquin River RMP Portal. Stephen detailed their process moving forward. They plan to reach out to their stakeholders to identify their needs. What data or questions are of interest to the various stakeholders? How could information be most effectively displayed or presented on the portal? Stephen outlined potential questions, including: Are the fish safe to eat; Is the water safe for recreation; Is the aquatic ecosystem healthy etc. He acknowledged that these questions are similar or in line with the question driven approach of the Monitoring Council. He also indicated that their approach overlaps with several of the workgroups of the Monitoring Council.</p> <p>Jon Marshack emphasized the nexus between the efforts of the Sacramento River Watershed Program and the Estuary Workgroup, since the Sacramento River feeds into the San Francisco Bay Delta Estuary. Jon also mentioned that this initial effort is funded, but to be sustainable in the long term, there needs to be ongoing funding—and from various stakeholders. He added that SFEI and 34North are moving to open source formats, but there is resistance within the state regarding going down that path,,, which is a challenge. Karen Larsen asked whether the Data Management Workgroup is dealing with this issue. Jon indicated that they could, but they have not done so yet. He added that he hopes that the Environmental Data Summit White Paper will be a galvanizing force to get the Data Management Workgroup to champion that path. Fran Spivy-Weber asked who uses the portals. Jon mentioned that we have Google analytics to track portal use; however, he added that the Water Board does not have staff assigned to analyze the resulting data.</p> <p>Sarge Green commented that the different regions see themselves as having different functions (and cultures) with regard to water. He asked whether the Sacramento River Watershed Program has conducted outreach to other RMPs</p>	

	as well as any efforts to develop portals. Stephen indicated that they have not yet conducted such outreach, but plan to as they move forward. Armand Ruby agreed with Sarge's comment, and added that he thought it was inefficient and less productive for each region to independently develop their own portals—he emphasized the need to coordinate and collaborate in these efforts, where possible, using common data management tools.
--	--

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>9</b>	
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>WATERSHED AND REGIONAL REPORT CARDS: LESSONS LEARNED FROM EFFORTS IN THE SAN DIEGO RIVER WATERSHED</b>	
<b>Purpose:</b>	Brock Bernstein provided an update on progress, challenges, and opportunities in developing regional report cards	
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	Identify additional opportunities for coordinating similar efforts across the state	
<b>Background:</b>	<p>Efforts by the State Water Board and others to develop improved and more consistent indicators of condition in streams and other water bodies have occurred in concert with increased interest in how regional and landscape scale processes affect conditions in and around streams. At the same time, progress in cleaning up gross sources of contamination along with increased understanding of how habitat affects biological condition has begun to shift attention away from a narrow focus on pollutants to broader concerns about the influences of instream, riparian, and upland habitats. A number of report card efforts have attempted to capture this broader range of cause-effect relationships, to varying degrees of success.</p> <p>An ongoing collaborative project in the San Diego River watershed illustrates the challenges and opportunities involved in developing useful report cards. This effort succeeded in engaging a wide range of participants and in capturing and using an equally wide range of data types. Rigorous scoring methods were available for some data types but not others. Where scoring methods existed, they were usually on different scales. Indicators included a mix of qualitative and quantitative metrics. Different programs sampled / measured on different time and space scales. While the draft report card highlighted the utility of integrating a wide range of indicator types, it also highlighted challenges in two main areas. First, additional technical effort is needed to develop scoring methods and approaches for integrating disparate indicators to answer different types of questions. Second, applying a regional report card requires the active and ongoing participation of parties that extend beyond the usual water quality suspects. There is significant potential for collaboration and integration across multiple similar efforts ongoing and/or planned in southern California and the Central Coast.</p>	
<b>Attachment Link:</b>	<a href="#">San Diego River Watershed Report Card</a> – presentation by Brock Bernstein	
<b>Contact Person:</b>	Brock Bernstein	<a href="mailto:brock@brockbernstein.com">brock@brockbernstein.com</a> , (805) 646-8369
<b>Notes:</b>	Brock Bernstein made a <a href="#">presentation</a> regarding efforts by the San Diego Regional Water Board and partners to develop improved and consistent indicators of condition in streams and other water bodies in the San Diego River watershed. During his presentation, Brock provided a brief introduction to the	

	<p>San Diego River watershed. He indicated that the discharger monitoring taking place in the San Diego River Watershed had been poorly integrated and only allowed for partial assessments, which provided ineffective support for decision makers.</p> <p>Their hope is to develop a collaborative question driven approach for monitoring, similar to the Monitoring Council’s workgroups (Are ecosystems healthy? Is water safe for swimming? Are fish and shellfish safe to eat? Is water safe to drink?). Brock indicated that their goal was to engage public and academic communities in research, assessment, and management. In addition, he added that they have strived to enable views of the data and assessment results from different perspectives.</p> <p>They decided to develop a watershed report card, which Brock indicated was a good way of integrating and synthesizing data from multiple programs, and better enabled them to communicate their results to multiple audiences. Brock went through an example of their assessment methods, and the way those results are displayed (color coded for poor, fair, good, and excellent condition); he highlighted how this approach makes interpretation of results—and evaluation of trends over time—more accessible to a general audience. Brock also provided details regarding the methods of how their scoring system was developed, and regarding their ongoing work to develop indices and thresholds for their monitoring data. Data sets for different parameters were adjusted to a common scale and the results averaged between indicators to derive the indices.</p> <p>Following Brock’s presentation, Karen Larsen mentioned that the Central Coast Regional Water Board has developed similar report card assessments, including the Integrated Watershed Assessment performed by Cadmus. Brock indicated that they would greatly benefit from the tools developed by the Central Coast Region and Cadmus. Jon Marshack indicated that it would be great to combine the best aspects of these separate efforts into a “mashup” report card approach that could be used statewide. Brock indicated that they were working towards that goal; however, they would need funding to support those efforts. Karen asked who the champions were for this effort. Brock indicated that so far it had been the San Diego Regional Water Board with help from San Diego State University. He indicated that they want to incorporate monitoring efforts into permit requirements. Brock also added that the City of San Diego has been a big supporter of this effort, as has the regional office of the Department of Fish and Wildlife (collecting fish data) and the San Diego River Park Foundation (invasive plants). He indicated that they are currently working to layer as many indicators as possible over particular sights--this work is ongoing.</p>
--	--

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>HEALTHY WATERSHEDS PARTNERSHIP</b>
<b>Purpose:</b>	Lori Webber, facilitator of the Healthy Streams Partnership, presented a proposal to change the workgroup’s name and focus to the Healthy Watersheds Partnership.
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	Monitoring Council feedback and support for proposed change
<b>Background:</b>	Since the beginning of 2015, Healthy Streams Partnership has been working on a charter and a business plan for the work group. During this process, group

	<p>members have recognized that the group’s signature products – the “Healthy Streams” Portal and the CA watershed assessments – consider more than stream systems and, in fact, take a broader, watershed-wide perspective. The group has also recognized that there are significant opportunities to collaborate with other ecosystem health work groups, such as the Wetlands Work Group, on watershed-level analyses of aquatic ecosystem health. As a result, the Healthy Streams Partnership proposes to change their name to the Healthy Watersheds Partnership, to better reflect the existing work products as well as future projects and collaboration opportunities identified in the business plan currently under development by the group.</p>	
<b>Attachment Links:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Healthy Streams Partnership webpage</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Healthy Streams Portal</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Healthy Streams Partnership Update</a> – presentation by Lori Webber</li> </ul>	
<b>Contact Person:</b>	Lori Webber	<a href="mailto:lori.webber@waterboards.ca.gov">lori.webber@waterboards.ca.gov</a> ; (916) 341-5556
<b>Notes:</b>	<p>Lori Webber provided a brief <a href="#">presentation</a> on the background of the Healthy Streams Partnership and its membership. She showed the portal and the group’s Integrated Assessment of Watershed Health report, which was developed by the Cadmus Group with funding from USEPA’s Healthy Watershed Initiative. Lori then discussed the group’s recent work to develop a mission statement and programmatic goals. During this discussion, the group concluded that they should shift their focus from streams to watersheds and change their name to the Healthy Watersheds Partnership. Lori added that the group felt that this would help to attract additional partners. She then described some potential watershed assessment projects, such as displaying existing Cadmus Integrated Assessment maps on the portal using EcoAtlas, as well as identifying candidate priority watersheds for protection and restoration. They also expressed an interest in developing additional watershed health indicators as well as evaluating potential data integration methods.</p> <p>Lori mentioned that the group is also interested in portal enhancements such as the development of statewide integrated assessment report cards, which builds on regional report card efforts. She also indicated that watershed-based reports (e.g., TMDL report cards, Non-Point Source success stories) were also of interest to the group. They plan to conduct outreach for additional partners, such as the Wetland Monitoring and Estuary Monitoring Workgroups.</p> <p>Following the presentation, Jon Marshack emphasized that the group is looking for more than a name change—this is a change of focus for the group. Jon mentioned that the group would like to look more broadly than streams and expand based on the work developed by Cadmus. Steve Weisberg indicated that he was pleased that the group is taking an individual project and trying to further develop and expand that work. He agrees that the name change and change in focus is a good decision—one he would support. Karen Larsen indicated that the drinking water program is pushing to have more coordination between clean drinking water and source water protection. Karen added that they would like to have a workshop to explore these ideas and potential connections, perhaps with EPA Healthy Watershed Initiative funding. Beth Christman mentioned that she supported the proposed changes. Sarge Green also expressed support of the change in name and focus. He also indicated that the group should check with different agencies involved in local land use planning, such as the Strategic</p>	

	<p>Growth Council, which may have developed similar tools to those proposed by the group—he emphasized the need for communication and outreach.</p> <p>Travis Pritchard observed that all of the workgroups are asking similar questions regarding data management and visualization. He expressed a need for adaptability of the current infrastructure to allow one group to build on the efforts of another. The Data Management Workgroup could help in this area.</p>
<b>Decisions:</b>	The Monitoring Council approved the Healthy Streams Partnership’s change in focus from streams to watersheds. They also approved the change in name for the group to the Healthy Watersheds Partnership.

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>PROPOSITION 1 WATER BOND</b>
<b>Purpose:</b>	Kris Jones of the Monitoring Council and Sara Aminzadeh of the California Coastkeeper Alliance led a discussion regarding Proposition 1 funding and the potential links to Monitoring Council workgroup related efforts.
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	Information and discussion
<b>Background:</b>	<p>In November 2014, the voters approved the Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014 (<a href="#">Prop 1</a>), which provides \$7.5 billion in general obligation bonds for water storage, water quality, flood protection, and watershed protection and restoration projects. Proposition 1 includes funding specifically intended to achieve the three overarching goals described in the California Water Action Plan: restoration, resilience, and reliability. The Budget proposes \$532.5 million to begin the first year of a multiyear Proposition 1 expenditure plan.</p> <p>Approximately half of the <a href="#">Prop 1 guidelines</a> have been released and others are still under development. The first solicitations for Prop 1 are <a href="#">scheduled</a> to be posted in July 2015. It is unknown whether the unreleased Guidelines will provide any direct or indirect support for the Monitoring Council’s related efforts; the majority of draft Guidelines aim to fund on-the-ground projects that create additional water supplies, protect existing water supplies, or improve water quality and habitat. However, there are several Prop 1 programs that may either directly provide support to programs or projects already developed or being developed by Monitoring Council workgroups, or could provide indirect support by requiring data from individual grant projects be collected according to workgroup-developed protocols (e.g., SWAMP or WRAMP) and submitted to data systems that support the Monitoring Council’s portals (e.g., CEDEN and EcoAtlas).</p> <p>During the discussion, representatives from various agencies will provide a brief overview of Prop 1 funding, as it relates to their respective programs—how funding is acquired and spent, brief overview of agency-specific Proposition 1 guidelines, as well as the grant solicitation process. Representatives from the Monitoring Council’s workgroups will also engage in the discussion to ask questions and gain insights regarding leveraging these resources for their respective efforts.</p>

<p><b>Attachment Links:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Proposition 1: the Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Natural Resources Bond Accountability</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Draft Guidelines for Proposition 1</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Draft Proposition 1 Program Development Schedule</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Proposition 1 Water Bond and Wetlands Status &amp; Trends Program Example</a> – presentations by Kris Jones and Chris Potter</li> <li>• <a href="#">State Water Resources Control Board Proposition 1 Funding Summary</a> – chart by Leslie Laudon</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Contact Person:</b></p>	<p>Kris Jones</p>	<p><a href="mailto:kristopher.jones@water.ca.gov">kristopher.jones@water.ca.gov</a>; (916) 376-9756</p>
<p><b>Notes:</b></p>	<p>Kris Jones provided a <a href="#">presentation</a> on the background of Proposition 1 (Prop 1). Voters in California approved the Water Quality, Supply and Infrastructure Improvement Act in November 2014. Prop 1 provides \$7.5 Billion in general obligation bonds for: water storage, water quality, flood protection, watershed protection and restoration efforts. Kris provided links to the Natural Resources Agency website, which shows how Prop 1 funds are allocated (<a href="#">Bond Accountability</a>). Agencies allocated Prop 1 funds are required to develop guidelines that establish the process and criteria that the agency will use to solicit applications, evaluate proposals, and award grants pursuant to Prop 1. These Prop 1 guidelines identify the additional requirements applicable to Prop 1 funded projects and the project evaluation process for these projects. Kris indicated that a number of agencies have already posted their <a href="#">guidelines</a>, which also lay out the broad categories of projects that would be covered by their agency for Prop 1 funds (when solicitations are posted).</p> <p>The intent of this agenda item was for the workgroups to become better informed about the process of applying for Prop 1 funding, what agencies have been allocated Prop 1 funds, which agencies have posted guidelines or solicitations for grants, and what areas are covered by solicitations. These were among the topics to be address during the discussion. Kris showed another page on the Natural Resources Agency’s Prop 1 website, which shows the current <a href="#">schedule</a> and important timeframes regarding agency specific guidelines, solicitations etc. He also showed a link to a <a href="#">listserv</a>, which provides members up-to-date information regarding Prop 1 information (e.g., guideline and/or solicitation releases).</p> <p>Kris indicated that many of the guidelines aim to fund on-the-ground projects that create additional water supplies, protect existing water supplies, or improve water quality and habitat. However, he was uncertain whether Prop 1 funds could be used for the portals, or whether monitoring and assessment efforts could be funded by Prop 1. To help answer these (and other) questions, Kris had invited representatives from various agencies to participate in this discussion. He indicated that he also asked the workgroups to participate in the discussion to learn how their planned or proposed projects might be supported by Prop 1 funds. Kris introduced Muzaffar Eusuff (Department of Water Resources; Integrated Regional Water Management), Leslie Laudon (State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Financial Assistance), Adam Ballard (Department of Fish and Wildlife), Shakoora Azimi-Gaylon (Delta Conservancy), and Rainer Hoenicke (Delta Stewardship Council, Delta Science Program).</p>	

	<p>Each representative provided a brief introduction to their respective programs and efforts related to Prop 1. While Muzaffar, Leslie, Shakoora, and Adam represent agencies that have been allocated Prop 1 funds, Rainer indicated that the Delta Stewardship Council has been allocated no Prop 1 funds.</p> <p>DWR’s Integrated Regional Water Management Program guidelines focus on water conservation and increased water use efficiency. Leslie presented a <a href="#">chart</a> showing the Water Board’s program areas for Prop 1 funding. CDFW will distribute Prop 1 funding through two competitive grant programs: (1) the Watershed Restoration Grant Program will focus on watershed restoration and protection projects of statewide importance outside of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta) and (2) the Delta Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration Grant Program will focus on water quality, ecosystem restoration, and fish protection facilities that benefit the Delta. Delta Conservancy funding relates to ecosystem restoration in the Delta to the benefit of important species and their habitats, their guidelines include standardized monitoring, assessment, data management, QA, and data documentation. In comments on Prop 1 guidelines, the Delta Stewardship Council is emphasizing the need for consistency with policies in the Delta Plan – best available science, adaptive management plans. Leslie emphasized that the General Obligation Bond Law requires a focus on capital projects and infrastructure with a 15 year useable life; up to 10% can be used for monitoring, assessment, and planning functions.</p> <p>Following his introduction, Kris mentioned that he had asked Chris Potter (Natural Resources Agency) of the Wetland Monitoring Workgroup to briefly <a href="#">present</a> the Wetland Status and Trend Program (<a href="#">see slides 10-19</a>) and to make connections between these efforts and Prop 1 funds. Following the presentation, Leslie Laudon indicated that the workgroups would be able to make a pitch to the State Water Board by attending the workshops to advocate for their specific projects or programs. By doing this, she indicated that people could help shape the language in the State Water Board’s guidelines. She added that this approach could be used with other agencies as well, possibly allowing additional types of projects to be eligible for funding. Studies involving monitoring and assessment would need to support on-the-ground projects, such as effectiveness demonstration on a statewide basis. Prop 1 (CWC § 79738[a][3]) identifies scientific studies and assessments that support the Delta Science Program, or projects eligible for funding through the grant program, as an example of an eligible project type for the Department of Fish and Wildlife’s Delta Water Quality and Ecosystem Restoration Grant Program. Kris indicated that Shakoora Azimi-Gaylon helped draft language regarding data collection, comparability and sharing, that was being incorporated into the Department of Fish and Wildlife’s draft FY15-16 Proposal Solicitation Notice. He urged the workgroups to do the same, where applicable.</p> <p>Note: All workgroup leads had been encouraged to participate in this discussion in order to find areas where Proposition 1 may help their workgroup efforts. Unfortunately, a number of the Monitoring Council’s workgroups were not represented at the meeting.</p>
<p><b>Action Items:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As soon as possible, the workgroups of the Monitoring Council should brainstorm projects that could be supported by Prop 1 funds and get involved in the development of departmental guidelines to allow their projects to be considered for funding.</li> <li>• Chris Potter will follow up with Shakoora and Rainer regarding the Wetland</li> </ul>

	Status and Trends Program.	
<b>ITEM:</b>	12	
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	NEXT MEETING AGENDA	
<b>Purpose:</b>	<p>Plan agenda for August 27, 2015 Monitoring Council meeting in Sacramento. Potential items include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Future direction of CEDEN especially as it relates to becoming the data source for 303(d) impaired waters listings SWAMP Tools User Group (Lori Webber)</li> <li>b) The California Freshwater Species Database (Jeanette Howard, The Nature Conservancy)</li> <li>c) Assessing Aquatic Habitat Connectivity and Low-flow Ecological Thresholds (Robert Holmes, CDFW Water Branch)</li> <li>d) Story-telling Initiative of the Water Board's Office of Information Management and Analysis (Greg Gearheart)</li> <li>e) New groundwater law</li> <li>f) Possibility of holding a Monitoring Council annual conference</li> <li>g) Presentations from organizations within the Natural Resources agency (e.g., those identified in SB 1070) and next steps for outreach</li> <li>h) Department of Pesticide Regulation water quality and pesticide use data – possible options to get those data available and integrated onto one of the My Water Quality portals; Management Agency Agreement between DPR and the State Water Board will soon be rewritten</li> </ul>	
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	Develop agenda ideas for the August 27 meeting	
<b>Contact Persons:</b>	Jon Marshack	<a href="mailto:jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov">jon.marshack@waterboards.ca.gov</a> ; (916) 341-5514
<b>Notes:</b>	<p>The Monitoring Council expressed an interest in hearing Items (a), (b), (c), (d), (f), (g), and (h). The Monitoring Council agreed that they should discuss Item (e) at a later date, due to the groundwater law being relatively new. Sarge Green indicated that he felt that the annual conference (f) is of high importance, and others agreed. Steve Weisberg requested that agenda items emphasize using the Council for action, rather than merely discussion.</p>	

July 3, 2015  
Amended July 28, 2015  
Adopted August 27, 2015